

Date: Sun, 21 Mar 93 04:30:20 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #70
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 21 Mar 93 Volume 93 : Issue 70

Today's Topics:

 public apology
 remote monitoring...Like my phone ringing

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 20 Mar 1993 17:18:53 GMT
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!stevew@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: public apology
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <01GVWOL2KKNM9LV07M@IRIS.UNCG.EDU>, MOSIER@iris.uncg.EDU (Steve Mosier)
writes:

> BONG BONG BONG *****ENGLISH LANGUAGE USAGE ALERT***** BONG BONG BONG
>
> Steve KA0VYB writes:
> > their services. Irregardless of whether you are in the right or the
> ~~~~~
>
> Sorry. No such word. Please restart.
>

Warning Warning Warning !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

English Snob Alert !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Warning Warning Warning !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Well, I'm aware that Irregardless and regardless mean the same thing AND that it isn't considered good usage....but I've got a dictionary right in front of me that has it listed...so I'd say 1) It is a word and 2) Who cares...

Steve KA6S

Date: Sat, 20 Mar 1993 15:33:49 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: remote monitoring...Like my phone ringing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <morgdw.3.732389245@saturn.wwc.edu> morgdw@saturn.wwc.edu (DWIGHT CLINTON MORGAN) writes:

>I have heard two theories on reverse phone patches:
>
>1. The licensed person is the control operator from a distance and
>anyone can use the equipment so long as you are controlling it.
>
>2. I want to remotely monitor a device (my phone) and if I get a
>signal then I will originate a patch to my home line as control
>operator.
>
>My question is, do either of these theories hold water, why or why not?
>
>I have talked to the arrl and they say their personal opinion is that
>it should be legal but currently the fcc thinks that a nonham is a
>cognate force causing the signal therefore they are using the radio
>illegally.

This is the FCC's position. Carrier origination must not occur by action of unlicensed persons. Since the person dialing the number is the originator of the action to cause the radio to transmit to alert you of an incoming call, it's illegal in the FCC's eyes.

>My objective is to get my phone calls anywhere, conversation non
>business, how can I legally do it?

Buy a cellphone.

>Is it legal for an answering machine to signal me if I get any messages?

You can remotely *query* a system to detect a state change such as a ringing telephone, that's telemetry and is allowed, but *you* must originate the query action that causes the remote transmitter

to activate. It can't activate automatically.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244		

Date: Sat, 20 Mar 1993 15:37:21 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C41zro.H62@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1o8mv1INNgb1@topaz.bds.com>, <1993Mar18.063843.351@qualcomm.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Reduction of the code requirements

In article <1993Mar18.063843.351@qualcomm.com> karn@servo.qualcomm.com (Phil Karn) writes:

>

>That's one thing that really annoys me about the airlines. All sorts
>of newer navigation systems are becoming available, and not only are
>they generally more accurate and reliable than VOR, but they're
>inherently much more immune to interference from consumer electronic
>devices. (I'm thinking mainly about LORAN-C and GPS -- once GPS
>becomes operational both should be installed as backups for each
>other). But no - the airlines would prefer to ban all electronics (not
>just receivers).

Don't flame the airlines too much Phil. They're operating under antiquated FAA rules that are less easily changed than FCC rules. The FAA mandates the systems they can use. And those happen to be the systems the FAA has. Trying to get the federal airways systems updated is like rolling a rock up a hill.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244		

Date: Sat, 20 Mar 1993 05:07:11 GMT
From: qualcom.qualcomm.com!unix.ka9q.ampr.org!karn@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1oaa5bINNgnq@topaz.bds.com>, <1993Mar19.023008.15269@qualcomm.com>, <1ocv97INNncd@topaz.bds.com>
Reply-To : karn@servo.qualcomm.com
Subject : Re: No Radios on Airlines

In article <1ocv97INNncd@topaz.bds.com>, ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
> The FAA is actively pursuing GPS. I don't have any doubt that it will
> eventually replace most of the existing navigation systems. LORAN does
> not have the precision for replacing the existing Instrument Navigation
> system. It would be a nice back up to GPS for most things though.

Agreed. I just wish it would happen a little faster. I'm not sure I agree about LORAN being imprecise, though. GPS is certainly better, but LORAN-C is plenty good enough for IFR enroute navigation.

The real problem with LORAN-C is coverage. Although the continental US is now fully covered, outside of North America, the North Atlantic, coastal Europe, Japan and a few other isolated places like Saudi Arabia and Hawaii, LORAN is pretty spotty. There's almost none in the southern hemisphere, for example.

But that doesn't mean LORAN-C can't or shouldn't be used indefinitely as a backup for domestic US flights. It's a very bad idea to put all your eggs in one system basket, even a good one like GPS. And the wide difference in RF frequencies (100 KHz for LORAN-C, L-band for GPS) gives you a lot of inherent protection against local RFI sources, few of which are probably going to put out truly broadband noise. Just having your radionavigation systems outside of the VHF band (instead of right next to the FM broadcast band) will be a big win.

Just think - some day the FAA might even allow ham handhelds to be used on board commercial aircraft...

Phil

Date: Sat, 20 Mar 1993 15:41:28 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9303181525.AA08444@ucsd.edu>, <1oaa5bINNgnq@topaz.bds.com>, <1993Mar19.023008.15269@qualcomm.com>%
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: No Radios on Airlines

In article <1993Mar19.023008.15269@qualcomm.com> karn@servo.qualcomm.com (Phil Karn) writes:

>They only buy what the FAA forces them to buy.

They only buy what the FAA *mandates* they buy. Any use of an unapproved system would open them up to incredible legal liability suits if there were an accident. Remember the government's golden rule; whatever is not mandatory is forbidden.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244			

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #70
